



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tary drill taught in our public schools, on the express ground that as the old soldiers pass away they should leave behind them some men qualified to fight. We cannot condemn all these things nor can we change them. I simply speak of them to show that there is a great deal to foster the military spirit which has been rampant for some years.

To counteract this spirit we must do all that we can to make our nation a peaceful nation, opposed to war, in favor of settling disputes by international arbitration.

Another thing we ought to do is to promote commerce between nations. Commerce is a great civilizer, and nothing so binds nations together as unrestricted trade. In early days every nation was arrayed against every other nation, ready to fight, ready to do all the injury possible by restrictions upon trade. That is gradually being changed, and it should be completely changed. For the present, probably, we must erect tariff barriers, but the time will come when trade and commerce will be as free as between the States of this country; and then war will be utterly impossible, because the nations will be so dependent upon each other. A distinguished senator of the United States said many years ago, "Commercial dependence is the greatest security for national independence."

How are we to accomplish this? We have first to cultivate public sentiment against war, and in favor of what we have called arbitration. Arbitrators are not necessarily temporarily appointed for a particular case; we have had in some states permanent boards of arbitration, and so there might be a permanent board of international arbitration. The first thing will be the settlement of individual cases; the two nations having a dispute, first having tried diplomacy, may submit their difference to a temporary court of arbitration. By this system the public mind is educated, and nations get used to the idea. In process of time, the thing to be aimed at is a permanent board of arbitration, or a permanent court for the arbitration of international disputes. I apprehend, however, that before that is reached a great many difficulties will have to be surmounted. It would probably be necessary to bring in nearly all the civilized nations of the earth, and there will be disputes about representation,—whether the smaller powers should have the same representation as the larger powers—disputes more difficult, as between the nations, than the disputes which almost wrecked the efforts to form a constitution for this country. Yet I have the greatest faith that, under the improvement in the public conscience which must be accomplished by the moral and religious forces which are now at work, this great tribunal will at some time be erected.

Some one has suggested the difficulty of enforcing the judgments of such a tribunal. I apprehend there will not be the least difficulty. In the seventy-nine or eighty

cases already referred to, every award has been practically approved and carried out; that shows that public sentiment presses upon the nations so that they do not dare to disregard the decision. But suppose any nation should refuse to obey the award? No judgment can be entered in such a tribunal as we are talking about. But its decision can be enforced as we would enforce a judgment against an individual. If an individual refuses to pay, his property is seized, or even his person. If any nation should so refuse, the other nations which are combined in favor of settling disputes in that way can enforce the award by seizing property, if necessary, by force of arms; and this would not be war in the sense in which war is waged now.

I conclude by saying, let us show through all the organs of our national life that we are a nation of peace, and thus lead the way in the pacification of the nations.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE FRENCH PARLIAMENT, JULY 8.

WITH PREAMBLE AND ADDRESS OF THE MOVERS.

PROPOSITION.

To invite the government to negotiate as soon as possible the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the French republic and the republic of the United States of America.

(Made special.)

Presented by MM. Barodet, Charles Beauquier, Montaut (Seine-et-Marne), Félix Mathé, Henry Maret, Camille Pelletan, Mesureur, Gustave Rivet, Victor Leydet, Jules Seigfried, de La Batut, Jacques, Louis Million, Bovier-Lapierre, Lagnel, Victor Poupin, Guillemaut, Farjon, Antide Boyer, Fernand Rabier, Pajot, Magnien, Bourgeois (Jura), Alfred Leconte, Frebault, Hubbard Crémieux, Guillemet, Michou, Gillot, Jouffray, Genet, Lesage, Baulard, Cornudet, and Chavoix.

EXPLANATION OF THE OBJECTS.

Messrs.,—On the 24th of April, 1888, Frederic Passy, a deputy, and a large number of his colleagues, presented to the Chamber a proposition tending to the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the French republic and the republic of the United States of America.

This is the proposition, which received the unanimous approval of all of the committees of the Chamber, but which, on account of some trouble in the interior at the time, which no person has forgotten, could not be discussed at that time, which we take up again to-day.

France, gentlemen, is not ignorant of the fact, that in the actual situation of Europe she cannot dispense with keeping up for her protection a military force at least equal to that of the best armed nation. She has consented without a murmur to all the sacrifices which this situation has imposed upon her; but, without renouncing any

one of her legitimate hopes, she has not missed any occasion to manifest her peace sentiments and her lively desire to substitute in the place of the bloody chances of war and the abuse of force, the principle of international arbitration, inspired by justice and right.

Thanks to the judicial labors and the active propaganda of the peace societies, so numerous in the two worlds; thanks to the interparliamentary conferences holding their sessions each year since 1889 in the different European capitals; thanks, we must say also, to the success of all the attempts at arbitration already made, before and since the Alabama affair, this beneficent idea of solving all international conflicts by means of arbitration, is impressing itself upon the minds of nations and of parliaments.

Several years ago the American republics concluded at Washington a permanent treaty of arbitration between themselves, and more recently, in June, 1893, the British House of Commons, with the support of Mr. Gladstone, then at the head of the Cabinet, passed by a unanimous vote, the proposition of Mr. Cremer and of Sir John Lubbock for the conclusion of a similar treaty with the United States.

We understand very well that, because of a feeling of pride not unworthy of a great nation so cruelly treated, the French government was not at first in haste to take the initiative in such a measure; but, gentlemen, the times have changed; the equilibrium has been restored; Europe is now conscious of our strength and respects us.

This is why — after the peace sentiments that were expressed by France with so much force and unanimity by the memorable manifestations that marked the reception of the Russian marines in 1893, and which have not ceased to animate her since that time — we are certain that by our proposition we are acting in harmony with her most cherished wishes.

The conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the French republic and the republic of the United States, whose acceptance is certain, will be a new proof of the friendship of the two great nations, a new pledge given to the world, progress towards the diminishing of military expenses, in short, a grand example, which, we have the firm conviction, coming as it does from such a high source, will soon be followed by all civilized peoples.

Therefore, gentlemen, we have the honor to ask of you the adoption of the following proposition:

“The Chamber invites the government to negotiate as soon as possible the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the French republic and the republic of the United States of America.”

In the recent death of Hon. H. O. Houghton, head of the great Publishing House of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., humanity has lost one of its best and truest friends. He had been for many years one of the honorary vice-presidents of the American Peace Society.

RULES RELATING TO A TREATY OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Prepared by the SPECIAL COMMITTEE, appointed in London, October 10, 1893.

1. Unless it be intended that all possible differences between the nations, parties to the treaty, are to be referred to Arbitration, the class of differences must be defined.

2. If the tribunal to which the reference is made is to be specially constituted, as between the nations, parties to the treaty, full provision for its due constitution must be made. Under this head provision for filling vacancies in the tribunal will naturally find place.

Suggestions:—

a The members of these Tribunals should not be representatives or subjects of any one of the States which are parties to the Arbitration, or of other States which have a direct interest in the solution of the question at issue.

b By way of greater guarantee of independence, the Tribunal should be composed of five or more members, who shall not be capable of having others substituted for them, or of being themselves removed, except for such causes as would, under ordinary rules of procedure, lead to their removal or to the substitution of other judges.

3. If the tribunal is to be specially constituted, the place of meeting must be fixed. This should be outside the territories of the parties to the controversy.

4. If the tribunal consists of more than two members, provision should be made for the decision of all questions by a majority of the arbitrators; but the dissentient members should have the right of recording their dissent and the grounds thereof.

5. Each party should be required to appoint an agent to represent it in all matters connected with the arbitration.

6. The Treaty should provide that if doubts arise as to whether a given subject of controversy be comprised among those agreed upon as subjects of Arbitration in it, and if one of the parties require the doubt to be settled by Arbitration, the other party must submit to such Arbitration, but may require that the judgment be limited to the admissibility of the demand for Arbitration.

7. The procedure should be fixed by the Treaty. It is suggested that a procedure by case, counter-case, and printed argument, each delivered by both parties simultaneously at a fixed date, with final oral argument (debate), is generally the most suitable. But the essential is that the procedure should be defined. The periods of the time allowed for the delivery of cases, counter-cases, and printed arguments should be fixed by the Treaty, but the tribunal should have the power of extending the time. The tribunal itself should fix the time for hearing the oral argument (debate).

8. Either party should be entitled to require production of any document in the possession or under the control of the other party, which in the opinion of the tribunal is relevant to a question in dispute.

9. Neither party should be entitled to put in evidence documents (hereinafter called “domestic documents”) which, having existed, or purporting to have existed,